Remarks

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are pending in the present application and all stand rejected. By this amendment claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claim and not for any reasons related to patentability. Support for the amendments in claim 1 may be found, for example, on pages 12-14 and in FIGs. 4-6 of the present application. Since no substantive changes are being made to the claims, Applicants kindly request that the amendments be entered.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present rejections based on the following remarks.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Culbertson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,902). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Concerning independent claim 1, this claim recites, among other things, "a spray head including a hollow body ... and an insert having an axial bore and configured to axially insert into the hollow body, wherein the combination of the hollow body and the insert define a spray nozzle at a front end of the spray head." The air cap adapter 16 appears to be characterized in the present Office Action as equivalent to the claimed "spray head" and fluid nozzle 13 is characterized as the claimed "insert." Closer inspection of the teaching of Culbertson, however, reveals that this equivalence is not tenable in light of the claimed elements. First, the air cap adapter 16 is not a spray head, but an adapter. Thus, the asserted equivalence is not accurate.

Furthermore, even if the fluid nozzle 13 of Culbertson might partially insert axially into the air cap adapter 16, the combination thereof does not define a spray nozzle at a front end. Rather, the fluid nozzle 13 connected to an air cap 12 in Culbertson comprise a spray nozzle assembly 11 (See FIG. 7 of Culbertson). Accordingly, the asserted elements of Culbertson (i.e., 16 and 13) do not teach or suggest "an insert having an axial bore and configured to axially insert into the hollow body, wherein the combination of the hollow body and the insert define a spray nozzle at a front end of the spray head" as recited in claim 1. As an example in the present application of this claimed combination, FIGs. 5 and 6 of the present application illustrate a spray

nozzle 153 defined at a front end by hollow body 158 and insert 159 having bore 157. Such structure, which is an example of the claimed features, is not taught by Culbertson.

Claim 1 further recites "a liquid reservoir coupleable to the hollow body and the axial bore of the insert for supplying liquid to the spray nozzle in response to actuation of the trigger mechanism such that liquid from the reservoir is delivered to the spray nozzle through the spray head without passing through the spray gun body." Culbertson, in contrast, actually teaches that fluid inlet fitting 20, which presumably may couple to a reservoir, is connected to the spray gun body 1a, as clearly shown by FIGs. 1, and 5-10. Accordingly, Culbertson does not teach or suggest "coupleable to the hollow body and the axial bore of the insert" as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, since the inlet fitting 20 is attached to the spray gun body 1a not air cap 16 or any other part of the spray nozzle assembly 11 or carrier 15, the structure of Culbertson necessitates that the liquid from the reservoir must pass through inlet 20 and the spray gun body 1a. Accordingly, Culbertson does not teach or suggest a structure affording the claimed feature of "liquid from the reservoir . . . delivered to the spray nozzle through the spray head without passing through the spray gun body."

With regard to dependent claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, and 17-19, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits, and also due to their ultimate dependency on independent claim 1 discussed above.

Concerning independent claims 15 and 20, these claims feature elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Further with regard to dependent claim 16, this claim is believed to be allowable on their merits, and also due its dependency on independent claim 15.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Culberson et al. in view of McRitchie (U.S. Patent No. 3,236,459). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that these claims are allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 1 discussed above, as well as on their merits.

Claims 3-5, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Culberson et al. in view of Holt. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that

these claims are allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 1 discussed above, as well as on their merits.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please contact the undersigned should there be any questions or in order to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

August 30, 2007
Date

By: Pamela L. Stewart
Pamela L. Stewart, Reg. No.: 45,707
Telephone No.: 651-733-2059

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833